

A3652

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 6

Our people are both proud and self-reliant. Twice within 50 years ambitious rulers of foreign powers have started two world wars, in the belief that America had grown into lethargy and indifference and either could not or would not mobilize its resources in defense of America or America's allies. At a cost of millions of men and uncountable material resources each learned that the courage and strength of America is a very real thing.

The economic strength of the United States is still the strongest of any nation on earth. The private enterprise segment of the American economy is stronger than the private enterprise counterpart of any other country on earth. Research and development in the physical sciences, in the natural sciences, and in medicine bring more real progress in the United States each year than in the rest of the world combined. These advances we gladly share with all people on earth.

Based upon a belief in the accuracy of these statements, I think that the future of our Nation and our Government is brighter than it has ever been in its history. The horizons are unlimited—at least they are limited only by the willingness of the American people to make whatever effort and whatever sacrifice may be necessary to maintain the balance of power between the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government, and at the same time to maintain the balance of governmental powers between the Federal Government on the one hand and State and local governments on the other. Any problems of government capable of local determination including those of financing can best be handled at a local level by officials and administrators who know firsthand what the problem is and also know how to resolve it most quickly and most properly.

Most issues which concern us today are the same issues which have concerned all peoples of all nations since the beginning of recorded history. We have heretofore in this country found the right solutions in the hearts and minds of strong people.

A century ago our country faced some of the identical questions and I quote directly from a speech of the then President of the United States:

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting race and class hatreds.

"You cannot build character or courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."—A. Lincoln.

Each of these admonitions could well be followed by the leaders and the people of the United States today. To these I would add: both the hope and a prayer that this Nation will daily practice the theme of Law Day 1963: "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might." As we dedicate this Law Day 1963 to this theme, let us at the same time make it a day of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the blessings which he has given to this our land and our people. Let us make this a day of rededication to those things which have caused our Nation to grow to greatness and proudly reaffirm our faith in a supreme being—the Supreme Judge of the universe.

The "Truth in Lending" Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in the June 4 issue of the American Banker, an

editorial appearing stating the stand of the newspaper on the "Truth in Lending" bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAINST THE DOUGLAS BILL

With increasing frequency, it has been called to our attention that an isolated observation, contained in a paragraph of one of our columnists' report of a lengthy interview with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democratic, of Illinois, has been lifted out of context and offered as evidence that the American Banker has reversed its editorial stand against the "Truth in Lending" bill.

It has not.

We had not felt it necessary to comment on our opposition to the Douglas bill during the past few months, because we earlier had stated our opposition to it, and the reasons for that opposition, in full. But since the impression is being created that we have changed our position, it now becomes necessary to repeat our earlier statement.

We oppose the Douglas bill requiring the cost of credit to be expressed in terms of simple annual interest—as a percentage—as impractical, unworkable, and confusing. We note that the more than 40 States which have passed comparable "full disclosure" legislation have done so in terms of dollars and cents cost.

We also oppose the imposition of Federal standards in this field as an unnecessary encroachment of central government into the affairs of the States.

We are not in opposition to the principle of full disclosure. We are in opposition to the imposition of an awkward Federal scheme for it.

Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle, of May 29, 1963:

BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

The Federal Government some years ago changed its name to the "New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn" but everybody, including those naval regulations say should "know better," continues calling it the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Now the Yard is celebrating its 162d anniversary. The other day "Mr. Brooklyn" himself, Andrew S. Roscoe of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association, staged a luncheon and formal presentation in honor of that occasion.

For a time there was danger that the Federal Government might sharply curtail or even eliminate the Brooklyn Navy Yard. This would have been a disaster for Brooklyn, and we believe it would have been a terrible blow to shipping throughout this country. The Brooklyn Navy Yard is one of the most efficient, as well as the most famous, shipbuilding facilities in the world. Other governments throughout the free world realize this and are copying its methods with the permission of Government. The Yard, covering 291 acres, is worth about \$1 billion. But more important, it is one of the most important

industrial centers in the country, and by far the biggest in Brooklyn. Some 12,000 employees are on the payroll, which totals \$85 million per year. Another 15,000 families make their living from companies which furnish supplies and materials to the shipyard. The Brooklyn Navy Yard, in fact, is one of the principal factors making up Brooklyn's vast seagoing industry, which provides 15 percent of the employment in this borough. The Brooklyn Navy Yard, like the Brooklyn Bridge, is so much a part of this borough that it was particularly fitting Monday to see "Mr. Brooklyn" in charge of the ceremonies honoring Rear Adm. Ernest C. Holtzworth, commander of the Yard, in the presence of our leading civic and political leaders.

But then, if we congratulated Andrew Roscoe every time he deserved it, there wouldn't be room for much else in this column.

If the Brooklyn Navy Yard is known all over the world as the "Can Do" construction and repair yard, the president of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association is certainly the "Can Do" civic leader.

Workmen still marvel over the Brooklyn Navy Yard's great engineering feat in World War II. Two destroyers, damaged by German torpedos, managed to reach the Yard. The Brooklyn Navy Yard engineers made one good ship of the two—"marrying" the U.S.S. *Menges* and the U.S.S. *Holder*. As Mr. Roscoe's brochure on the Navy Yard says, the merging of the two destroyers "is regarded as one of the most spectacular surgical repair jobs ever to be performed" on ships.

We greet the Brooklyn Navy Yard on its anniversary. Hall, too, to the famous ships built there—including the Battleship *Maine*, blown up while riding at anchor in Havana Harbor in 1898; the battleship *Missouri* on which the Japanese surrender was signed; the famous U.S.S. *Saratoga*, all 60,000 tons of it; the world's largest super-carrier in naval history—the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, the *Independence*, and the *Constellation*.

These are proud chapters in the history of a proud borough Admiral Holtzworth and his 12,000 assistants deserve praise for a continuing good job in a climate of peace, patriotism, and understanding.

Cuba, All Over Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of our continued backing down and bungling of critical situations in our own hemisphere is spelled out in an editorial in the June 5 edition of Newsday. I am pleased to submit it for the RECORD:

CUBA, ALL OVER AGAIN

The United States has staged a humiliating backdown in Haiti. After suspension of contacts with the bloody Duvalier government—this in the hope that the dictator would be forced to flee—the administration has now ordered the resumption of "normal diplomatic business." Duvalier is thereby more firmly entrenched in office, and the hapless Haitians remain victims of his ruthless rule. It is another example of blundering on a par with our bipartisan handling of Cuba up to and including the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion. It makes us look ridiculous in the eyes of all Latin America, weakens the democratic neighboring government of

1963

and namesake in the student body of this university in the very near future.

Law Day is set aside as a day of national observance in the United States of America. It is the antithesis of the Communist May Day celebration which is celebrated throughout the Communist world. Law Day stands for a rule of right—not might and could accurately be described as a day dedicated to the dignity of man. May Day in the world behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains stands for tyranny, oppression and the elevation of the state over the individual.

The expressed purpose of Law Day is to impress upon the citizens of this country the great heritage of Anglo-American law, which protects our rights and freedoms. The solemn recognition and appreciation of our system of law is the perfect counterpart and antithesis of the Communist celebration of May Day, which is loudly celebrated throughout the Communist world with vast parades of troops and displays of armed might. A comparison of these two observances is the most vivid illustration of exactly why the theme for Law Day 1963, "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might," was selected.

In his proclamation designating Law Day 1963, President Kennedy recognizes the important part of our system of laws has played in the development of this country, when he quotes a former Justice of our Supreme Court as stating that: "The history of law is the history of the moral development of the races."

The word "law" has many meanings. We refer to laws of nature, laws of science, laws of economics, and laws of various other fields. In these instances we are confronted with certain facts so frequently or these facts are so inherent in human reasoning that we cannot conceive of any other alternatives, therefore, these facts are referred to as laws.

When we refer to the Golden Rule, we refer to a rule of morals or ethics that is the product of the development of civilization and we tend to regard it as a "law," but there is no compulsion behind the enforcement of ethical rules of conduct, except public opinion and our own conscience.

The word "law" as used in connection with Law Day has a meaning different from any of the aforementioned. When used in this sense we are referring to that set of rules of human conduct that are prescribed by a supreme governmental authority and enforced by the state through its courts. It can be said that "law" is the codified commonsense and good judgment of the ages. It must be that if a government under laws is to survive.

The theme of Law Day for 1963 is "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might." I think we find ourselves in accord that the United States of America would not have achieved its pre-eminent position of leadership among all nations of the world if this had not been the underlying principle of our system of jurisprudence in this country. We in America have been blessed by the principles of constitutional government and by the Anglo-American system of jurisprudence which has made this constitutional Government a reality.

It is probable that our Nation will survive for more than a millennium against all threats from external sources. Many historians, as well as many contemporary political scientists and philosophers, are of the firm belief that if America ever falls from its towering position of strength and leadership that it will be caused by weakness from within rather than from any external force.

Many believe that the greatest single threat toward the enduring strength and security of the United States of America is the noticeable trend toward absolutism.

As the main topic of my remarks today, I would like to discuss the theory of absolutism and the very real dangers which are in-

herent in it. Within the past year, the subject of absolutism has become a rather controversial one; and my purpose of discussing it today is not to add fuel to the controversy, but rather to warn of some of its dangers.

Let me emphasize that I do not question the motives, the patriotism, or the sincerity of those who advocate the principles of absolutism. They have a perfect right to those beliefs. I disagree with the theory of absolutism and with those who advocate it, but I believe that they are honest in their beliefs just as I assume that they attribute to me the honesty of my purpose.

The most dramatic way that I know to express this warning is by recalling your attention to the undisputed facts that the Caesars of Rome, the czars of Russia, Louis XIV and Bonaparte of France, and more recently Mussolini of Italy and Hitler of Germany were each, in their respective times, the foremost advocates of the theory of absolutism.

The devastation and destruction which each brought upon his respective country may not be attributable entirely to his adherence to absolutism, but it is at least a remarkable coincidence that each of these disciples of absolutism either totally or nearly destroyed his own country and his own people.

Several months ago, a colleague and I were discussing this very subject and we had slightly different ideas of the exact meaning. We turned to the lexicon to arbitrate our differences and while neither of us was exactly accurate, the dictionary defined absolutism as follows:

"The doctrine of that which is absolute, or without limitations; specifically, the doctrine or existence of unconditional power vested especially in an autocrat; despotism."

Secondary definitions were given, but I think that the foregoing expresses it best of all. Applied to the Government of the United States, the growing trend toward absolutism manifests itself in court decisions, in grants of power to the executive branch, and often times total disregard of prerogatives of State and local governments by administrative and executive officers of the Federal Government. With regard to the expressions of absolutism by the Court, you are aware that the decision in the school prayer case and its implication to all traces of religion in public activities is an example of what absolutism can lead to. I do not refer to this decision in an effort to be critical of the Court. I refer to it as an example of how far the trend toward absolutism has already gone.

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson invoked divine guidance for all our people describing them in his invocation as—

"Enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of the inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter—with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us happy and a prosperous people?"

"Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

Following the theory of absolutism, the Court would strike down everything in the above quotation attributed to Thomas Jefferson.

Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, has forcefully expressed his concern about this trend. He, like myself, has been

outspoken in his concern about the school prayer case and the application of the prohibitions contained in the first amendment against the States. To the best of my knowledge, prior to 1950, no one even claimed that the restraints laid down in the first five amendments restrained any echelon of government, except the Federal Government.

If the full circle of the trend of absolutism is completed, it will make hollow shells of every State capitol, county courthouse, and city hall in the United States. It will cause every subdivision of government to look to Washington for its solution to all problems. The solutions to most problems do not lie in Washington, but rather the solutions to most problems are close to the people—who are the only source of strength in this or any other country.

The Federal Government derives its strength from the strength of the 50 States and the people of the 50 States. It possesses no strength of its own—it can be no stronger than the source of its strength and power.

No President, however powerful and wise, can transmit his executive strength to the people over whom he presides. He can lead, yes. He can possess great wisdom and personal magnetism. But the strength of the government which he leads can only come from the broad base of the people.

Those who have authored every constitution of the State of Georgia surely had that in mind when, in their wisdom, they wrote article I, section I, paragraph I of our State's constitution which reads:

"ORIGIN AND FOUNDATION OF GOVERNMENT"

"All government, of right, originates with the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole. Public officers are the trustees and servants of the people, and, at all times, amenable to them."

Upon the belief that ultimate strength is derived from the people and that ultimate sovereignty resides there, our Government has grown from strength to greater strength. It would be tragic if we should deteriorate from strength to weakness because that belief should be changed.

Lest my views be misinterpreted, let me say forthrightly there are certain areas in which the power of the Federal Government must be absolute—among these are the conduct of foreign policy, maintenance of the Defense Establishment, regulations of interstate and foreign commerce, control of coinage and currency, and others clearly enumerated in our basic instrument of government.

When the Federal Government overreaches itself and extends its vast powers into subject matter which can best be done by the State, the counties, the cities, or by the people themselves, then the inevitable result is a deterioration of government in those areas which are exclusively Federal in their very nature.

Our Nation—its people—its Government may truly be the last great hope of earth. Surely the United States is the unquestioned leader of the nations of the free world. It could be that we are the main strength of Western civilization. I believe the best guarantee of a free world is a strong United States of America. An America, strong economically, militarily, industrially, and agriculturally, but most of all possessed of a people strong in purpose, character, and courage.

A strong America can be preserved by a proud and self-reliant people, with strong local governments at each level upon which a strong National Government and a strong Nation must surely rest.

If I have appeared overly critical of the theory of absolutism let me now make some positive and affirmative suggestions. Let me paint a confident and bright picture of the future.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3653

President Bosch in the Dominican Republic, and illustrates that we cannot keep our own hemispheric house in order.

The whole Haitian mess is thus compounded. From 1915 to 1934 we kept Marines in the country in an effort to restore order, encourage a viable economy, and lead the nation to an understanding of democracy. Successive U.S. administrations suffered then, as the present administration seems now to suffer, from the delusion that all was well. The minute the troops left, Haiti slumped back into chaos. This time our optimism was even less well founded. We dispatched a Navy-Marine task force to cruise off the coast as encouragement to Duvalier's enemies, secretly prepared for a landing of that force with the secret approval of three Latin American governments, exerted maximum diplomatic pressure, and then jumped to the conclusion that these acts would force Duvalier from office.

Properly enough we enlisted the Organization of American States in this project, but foolishly encouraged its members to believe that Duvalier would give up office and leave Haiti May 15, the end of his legal term of office. Since he did not, we have been made to look asinine to our Latin-American neighbors. No doubt the Russians, with their military forces still in Cuba, are chortling at this new ham-handedness.

The worst feature of that Haitian incident is the failure of our diplomatic and intelligence sources there to obtain accurate information or to assess correctly what information they gathered. It can be assumed that the CIA was active, as it was active in planning for the Bay of Pigs invasion. In both cases the conclusion was the same, and was false: that through pressure applied carefully, the peoples of Cuba and successively of Haiti would throw out their dictators.

This most recent series of blunders should alert the President to the crying need for more capable people to deal with Latin America, more sound sources of intelligence upon which to act, and advisers who know how to say "No" when the prospect is for failure. We would have done better to have stayed out of the Haitian imbroglio altogether.

The People Can End Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal. This short editorial explains exactly why it is so difficult to cut Federal spending and points to the way it can be done—if the people demand it and assume local responsibility instead of looking to Washington for handouts:

ON FEEDING AN OCTOPUS

In Doylestown, Pa., the other day, the borough council turned down the offer of a \$500,000 Federal project to redevelop part of the community's business area. One resident, typifying the opposition, said that just because there were "one or two buildings that aren't pretty" it didn't mean that the "octopus of Federal aid" should be brought in.

At about the same time, in southern Indiana, farmers were giving a warm welcome to Agriculture Secretary Freeman, whose plan

for stringent wheat controls they had helped bury under an avalanche of "no" votes. Greetings were friendly partly because Mr. Freeman has more than one string to his bow.

For instance, a farmer who said "just a little too much controls" were involved in the wheat plan is among those pressing for a substantial Agriculture Department grant for a dam project. Another who also voted against what he calls "regimented agriculture" heads his county's Rural Area Re-development Committee, one of Mr. Freeman's fast-growing projects.

So the octopus never gives up. And maybe it wouldn't be so fat if more people were like the Doylestowners who refused to feed it.

Pope John XXIII: Man of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the 6th of June is remembered in history as the day when thousands of Allied troops stormed the beaches of Normandy. Today, the 6th of June 1963, is a sad occasion for the world; John XXIII, the Pope of peace, will be laid to rest in the Basilica of St. Peter's. A day, remembered for an act of war, is now marked by the interment of a man of peace.

Giuseppe Angelo Roncalli was born in the small village of Sotte Il Monte in the midst of what he characterized as "serene poverty" and rose to become the "fisher of men," the full significance of that ancient phrase.

On October 28, 1958, he appeared on the central balcony of St. Peter's Basilica, the new pope, assuming the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church under the name of John. The throng in the huge square of St. Peter's saluted the new pontiff, unaware that this kindly man, called John the good, would emerge as the "Man of the Century."

From the beginning of his reign, Pope John made innovations which energized the church in its mission of salvation. With the gentility of a benevolent prince and the loving heart of a kindly peasant, the Pope looked to other religious leaders of the world and extended a brotherly arm "Ut Unum Sint."

Pope John's greatness became apparent through three events—the calling of the Ecumenical Council and the Encyclicals "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris." The spirit of brotherhood permeated his encyclicals, stressing the social nature of man and his dignity as an individual to be loved and saved regardless of station.

On another June 6th, in 1940, Pope John warned the world, "Everything serves to demonstrate that in the sense of true world peace there will be the gospel or we will return to bloodshed." Today, those words bear repeating as war continues to threaten mankind with annihilation.

As we recall the beaches of Normandy, long emptied to those infantrymen who gave their lives for freedom, we look to

the chair of Peter, now emptied of that great heart which beat with love for all mankind. The holy father was truly, the spiritual father of all humanity. As his children, as he is laid to rest, it remains for us to work in his image and with his spirit—"Ut Unum Sint"—so we may be remembered as men of this century.

TVA After Three Decades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, among the many tributes to the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority written and spoken in this 30th anniversary of its founding, the one in the Engineering News-Record is outstanding. It is the opinion of experts in engineering and long-range planning and is an objective report on what the TVA has accomplished for the people of 5 States and the Nation itself. To give my colleagues an opportunity to read this evaluation I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

TVA AFTER THREE DECADES

The Tennessee Valley Authority, created by act of Congress, May 18, 1933, received deserved praise on its 30th birthday from the President of the United States. Speaking at Muscle Shoals, Ala., near Wilson Dam and the nitrate-fertilizer plant of World War I vintage that were TVA's first physical assets, President Kennedy said TVA's accomplishments have given "the undecided and uncommitted peoples of the world an impression of growth and vitality and concern for human well-being which cannot be matched anywhere else in the world. In the minds of men the world over, the initials TVA stand for progress."

And the President was unquestionably right. This great river valley development is so widely known and revered abroad as to constitute one of our Nation's most useful assets. It enhances our reputation as planners, as engineers, builders, agricultural experts, and humanitarians. Even its public power aspect, which has had far from unanimous acclaim here at home, in nowise dims TVA's fame abroad where electric power development, distribution, and sale are more often than not in charge of some public agency.

TVA's reputation abroad, however, rests squarely on the fact that it transformed an entire river basin from a condition of mediocrity, well sprinkled with poverty, to a state of relative affluence based on industrialization and modernized agriculture. And this is just what so many of the "uncommitted and undecided" people in foreign lands are dreaming about and seeking means to achieve.

Here at home, and on its 30th birthday, TVA also deserves to be remembered and praised for its precedent-setting action in implementing for the first time the theory of comprehensive river development with multipurpose projects, and for carrying through this pioneer effort to so many notable results. Prior to TVA, only Hoover Dam could be pointed to as a multipurpose undertaking. But it was a single project on an otherwise undeveloped river. TVA, although stemming from what was aptly called in these pages "a

A3654

confusion of diverging motives," nevertheless hewed to the line of multipurpose development of an entire river from its source to its mouth. This made it unique.

Navigation, water conservation, flood control, hydropower, were the initial TVA objectives, but with public health, agricultural improvement, industrialization and, in general, raised standards of living as the really ultimate goals. Such a pattern of objectives is now common practice in river valley planning, and TVA pointed the way.

In contrast it is not likely that TVA's organizational pattern will be repeated again in the United States; there are no more river basins in a comparable state of undevelopment and need to that of the Tennessee 30 years ago; there is no great economic depression (and hopefully will never be) to make available at one time the pool of high-order engineering talent that was recruited to man TVA; experience has shown that comprehensive river development can be carried out through cooperative actions by existing Government agencies and private enterprise; and there is no present incentive or public support for a "public power yardstick" to curb private power utilities as there was when TVA began operation. Nevertheless, TVA after three decades of planning and building and working for and with the people in its region is a fixture in the Tennessee Valley, and one with continually emerging plans for the decades ahead. It is deserving of the praise the President gave it, and more.

As a beacon to developing nations, as the instigator of comprehensive river development in the United States and as a monument to good engineering and construction executed with integrity, the TVA is indeed a national asset.

Private Industry in a Growing Colombia— Speech by John R. White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by John R. White, vice president and director, Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, to a meeting of the National Association of Industrialists of the country of Colombia. The speech was made in Cartagena, Colombia, and is entitled "Private Industry in a Growing Colombia."

I think it is a very important speech showing what American business is still trying to do, in cooperation with the Alliance for Progress, in trying to cut countries in South America free from the shackles of an antiquated economic life. I want to congratulate them for what they are doing.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN A GROWING COLOMBIA
(Address by John R. White)

The opportunity to be here this evening makes me doubly grateful. I never fail to find pleasure in visiting Colombia and renewing many old friendships here, and especially

in coming to Cartagena with its historic beauty and its modern vitality. And I appreciate equally the privilege of meeting here with such distinguished leaders of the business and industrial community of Colombia.

Yesterday in this city we inaugurated a new plant, Amonlaco del Caribe—Amocar for short. Its products are ammonia and nitric acid—two chemical forms of nitrogen which are ingredients in the manufacture of nitrogen fertilizers. Not only for its operating company, International Petroleum (Colombia), Ltd., but also for the parent Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), which I represent, this plant is a significant new departure in the field of petrochemicals. We believe it will also be significant for Colombia's economic progress, and particularly for the growth of her agriculture, during this decade of her historic national effort as a member of the Alliance for Progress.

Let me now describe to you briefly the nature and purpose of this new venture.

One of the essential factors in a more productive agriculture is the efficient use of commercial fertilizers, including nitrogen fertilizers. For every peso spent on nitrogen fertilizer, a modern farmer often gains 5 pesos or more in the added value of his crops.

With the ever wider adoption of scientific farming methods, the annual consumption of nitrogen in commercial fertilizers in Colombia is increasing every year. It rose from 2,500 metric tons in 1950 to 20,000 metric tons in 1960. We estimate that it will continue to rise rapidly during the decade of the 1960's.

Hitherto all fertilizers have had to be imported into Colombia in finished or semi-finished form. The annual cost in foreign exchange for this purpose is some US\$15 million.

Therefore it is significant that in this year, 1963, Colombia can at last produce all her own nitrogen fertilizer requirements within the country, and from her own natural resources. The Jersey company is proud that its affiliate, Intercol, will play a key part in this new development in two ways—through its Amocar plant and through its one-third interest in Abonos Colombianos (Abocol), whose plant next door will turn Amocar's products into nitrogen fertilizers. The Amocar plant alone represents an investment of over US\$13 million in new funds and equipment.

Let me add that we welcome our fellow pioneer in this field, the new ammonia plant of Industria Colombiana de Fertilizantes at Barrancabermeja. The market in the coming years will certainly afford enough room for both of us.

Amocar's products will serve first of all as the source of nitrogen feedstocks for the Abocol fertilizer plant, which will open very soon. I should like to pay a tribute to the Colombian investors and businessmen whose leadership has been essential to the formation of Abocol. This is an outstanding example of local private enterprise at work in Colombia.

We have purposely built Amocar bigger than necessary to meet the immediate needs of the Colombia market. (In fact, Amocar is as large and modern an ammonia plant as now exists anywhere in the world.) For the next 3 years if not longer, that part of Amocar's products not needed within Colombia will be exported to new fertilizer plants under construction in Central America and the Caribbean.

But the main reason for Amocar's size is the anticipated growth in the demand for nitrogen fertilizer here in Colombia. From 20,000 metric tons of commercial nitrogen used in Colombian agriculture in 1960, we

estimate a sharp increase to about 75,000 tons by 1966 and possibly over 100,000 tons by 1968.

How can we sum up the advantage which Colombia's economy will derive from Amocar, and from the associated Abocol plant?

They will play a part in the growth of Colombian agriculture.

They also will help the foreign exchange picture. We estimate that Colombia's new fertilizer industry, of which Amocar and Abocol will be a major part, will immediately improve Colombia's balance of payments by about US\$9 million a year—and still more as the years go by.

The building of these plants has also stimulated the local economy. About 10 million pesos were spent in local procurement of materials. In the building of Amocar an average of 400 to 500 men were employed for 7 months.

Finally, these plants are backed by the full resources of Jersey's research affiliate in the United States, the Esso Research and Engineering Co., which is the largest research establishment anywhere in the petroleum industry. This means that both our manufacturing methods and our products here in Colombia will benefit from the continuous progress of Jersey's laboratories.

I believe it will interest you to know, in this connection, that the Amocar plant, and its neighbor, Abocol—as well as the related fertilizer plants in Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Aruba—constitute the first step in a major new program of fertilizer production on which Jersey and its affiliates are embarking at widely separated points around the world. Our affiliates already have definite plans to produce nitrogen fertilizers in Spain and the Philippines. We are also making studies for similar projects in several other areas.

The plants already built or planned in this program represent a total investment of about US\$116 million. By our estimates, their combined capacity will move Jersey-affiliated companies from zero in 1962 to a capacity of 1,330,000 metric tons, with a value of more than US\$100 million by the end of 1965.

Thus Jersey, which for many years has been a world leader in the petroleum industry, and whose existing products already have many uses in agriculture, will soon become one of the important producers of fertilizer in the world.

It is noteworthy that the plants I have mentioned are located not where agricultural productivity is already high, but in areas where more abundant food is required to meet the needs of expanding economies and fast-growing populations. In a decade when the American Republics, and the United Nations as well, have launched extraordinary efforts to raise living standards, we trust that our entrance into the fertilizer field on this considerable scale will not only be good business for us, but will take its place in the contribution of private industry to worldwide progress.

Now, it may occur to you to ask: Why did Jersey's first investment in the ammonia and fertilizer field come into being here in Colombia?

One could answer that question with another: Why have Jersey and its affiliates invested so heavily in Colombia over the past 40 years. For instance, beginning in 1951 we spent US\$77 million and 11 disappointing years exploring for new oilfields in Colombia—until finally the new Provincia field began to produce last year. What caused us to take that long-term risk?

The answer to all these questions is the same. In Colombia we have found it possible to invest under conditions that meet the three basic tests of any sound international investment.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3639

The man in the street has been feeling the pinch more and more and it gets more painful every day. Florida is facing the prospect of a grocery tax, which I think is downright wicked. Gasoline taxes are exorbitant. People let their homes go unpainted because they can't afford to keep them in tip-top condition. I see signs of financial distress everywhere among the middle class of people.

Why do we continue to try to be Santa Claus to the whole world? When are we going to say: "No more—we need it here at home?" And we do. Let me illustrate:

In our own private family situation, we managed to get ourselves into a financial mess through poor management and lack of vision. It took us about 6 years to do it and just recently woke up to face the facts, and they are not pleasant. We can look back and see now what we could and should have done to be in a solvent condition today. We have two precious daughters in their teens whose needs increase daily. We cannot do things we'd love to do for them because we don't have the means. We were too concerned about material things when we should have planned wisely to invest in the girls.

Now the point I want to make is that our Government seems to be overlooking its most valuable asset in favor of scattering money all over the world, hoping to win friends and influence nations who couldn't care less. The asset is us, the people, who are being crushed by unbearable taxes, much of it unnecessary, because of sinful, irresponsible, lavish, wasteful spending of someone else's money—ours.

What about education? What about health? What about old people? What about scientific and medical research? Funds for these and other causes always seem to be inadequate.

Sometimes I wonder what would happen if our country were run entirely by women. The average woman manages the household economy and has to do it carefully to meet the needs of her family. Why should our administrators, handling vastly more, and therefore having a much greater responsibility, be any less careful to make every dollar count? What has to be done in a domestic unit surely needs to be done in a national unit, the Government of these United States.

Please, gentlemen, let's govern our spending more wisely. Take a good long look at the domestic situation, at the plight of our own people, and stop being so concerned about the rest of the world, until we get our own affairs in order.

Some of us do not approve of the space program. Most of us are not competent to judge. One thing I am concerned about is that man, who cannot conquer himself, should be allowed to invade outer space and take along with him all his ugly vices, contaminating more of the universe with his sins. Will God allow it? I pray not.

Sincerely,

EDNA D. BENNETT.

Pork Barrel Deluxe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial entitled "Pork Barrel Deluxe." I call this to your at-

tention, Mr. Speaker, not only because the editorial is very timely but also because it expresses the thinking of my constituents at the grassroots.

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, May 27, 1963]

PORK BARREL DELUXE

Soon the House of Representatives will have a chance to vote on a \$455.5 million 2-year extension of the Area Redevelopment Administration. On its record, the House should vote "no."

Since ARA was authorized, unemployment trends have been inconclusive, but it is certain that ARA's expensive activities have had little effect for improvement. In all, far less than 1,000 new jobs per State have been created—and it's probable that in creating these jobs the program has destroyed many existing jobs.

Congress has learned details of many ARA projects, and they shouldn't cheer a taxpayer. The agency lent \$1.8 million to help build a motel in one city where the rate of occupancy for rooms was 54 percent. It lent over \$6 million to another city to build an auditorium, which might cheer up a depressed area somewhat, but which admittedly made no significant contribution to employment.

It has lent money for a papermill to take business from nearby papermills, and a soybean plant to take business from neighboring soybean plants. This was specifically enjoined in the bill which authorized the agency's existence.

This was expected by those who fought the legislation in the first place, and supporters of the ARA denied it could ever happen. But now we know.

And Congress should turn down further funds for ARA, unless it wishes to affirm the political adage: "The reward for failure is a larger appropriation."

Failures of American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the widow of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, first President of Israel, has written to a newspaper a thoughtful and poignant letter that should be read by all Members of the U.S. Senate.

Mrs. Weizmann points out that American, British, and Soviet policies have created a situation in the Middle East that is not in the interest of either the Israelis or of world peace.

I am less concerned about British and Russian policies than I am about our own. I believe that the present administration in Washington is negligent in its obligations to peace in the Middle East and fails to distinguish between human rights and material concepts.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, which appeared in the New York Times of June 6, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE EAST RIVALRIES—BELIEF EXPRESSED IN FUTURE OF ISRAEL AND TRIUMPH OF MORAL VALUES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Current developments in the Middle East, coupled with the ambiguous American, British, and Soviet policies toward them, have created a confused and confusing situation not only for the Israelis, who feel their security gravely jeopardized, but also for people of goodwill everywhere who cannot fathom big power attitudes.

Indeed, one wonders whether the so-called guardians of world peace are actually interested in maintaining pacific relations among Middle East countries, as they solemnly profess at the U.N., or regard this region solely as a maneuvering area for power conflicts.

Fifteen years have passed since Israel was established and recognized by the U.N. Nearly one and one-half million refugees have settled in it, to be productive in agriculture, industry, science; develop its raw materials; establish its educational and welfare systems, and provide for the immigrants, the aged, feeble, and sick.

For 15 years we have reminded of the half million Arab refugees in neighboring countries, who left of their own free will. Yet more Jewish refugees left Arab countries than Arabs left Palestine. Nevertheless, the vicious assertion that there are a million—not half a million—Arab refugees is Egypt's greatest political asset, even greater than its Mig jet fighters.

THREAT FROM EGYPT

Today Egypt poses the State of Israel with the same threat that Hitler, 25 years ago, posed the House of Israel, intoxicated by successes with two rival great powers, Nasser fails to realize that even Rameses lost in the end and that inquisitions, pogroms and gas chambers could not annihilate the Jewish people. The valiant inmates of the Warsaw Ghetto did not fight in vain. Today is no longer yesterday. History will not repeat itself. If the Naspers of the world recognize this, it will be the first step toward peace.

As for myself, I believe, as my husband did, in the ultimate triumph of moral values—although people must get a little push now and then so as to see them more clearly. I believe in the spirit of George Washington, who fought for freedom over Boston's 5 o'clock tea; in the spirit of Lafayette, who left his own country to help another people fighting for their human rights; in the spirit of Cromwell, who invited Jews to settle in England, and of the authors of the Balfour Declaration and those who made the State of Israel a miraculous reality. Their spirit will prevail again.

And I believe that no power on earth can balance the oil and political rivalries of the Middle East against the fate of 2 million and more Israelis. For it is said in I Samuel, xv, 29—"And also the eternity of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent."

VERA WEIZMAN.

REHOVOTH, ISRAEL, May 24, 1963.

Why Can't We Get Rid of Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an edi-

A3640

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 6

torial entitled "Why Can't We Get Rid of Castro" published in the current edition of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CAN'T WE GET RID OF CASTRO?

"The Cuban revolution has failed," Post contributing editor, Edward Behr, reports in this week's issue. By that, he means that the Communists have proved once again their almost miraculous talent for making a bad situation worse, for wrecking an economy and enslaving a people. What has not failed, however, is the establishment of Communist power in the Caribbean. Although the Kennedy administration understandably enjoys taking credit for getting Nikita Khrushchev's missiles out of Cuba last October, it understandably prefers to gloss over the fact that Soviet power today is more firmly entrenched off our shores than it was a year ago. There are some 15,000 Soviet troops in Cuba—enough to "suppress any internal rebellion" or "to offer severe opposition to any attack."

That judgment comes from a recent report by the Senate Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee, which raises an even more sinister question: Did these missiles really leave? The Senators admit they don't know. They also acknowledge that top U.S. intelligence officials, "to a man," hold to "their opinion that all strategic missiles and bombers have been removed from Cuba." But the Senators add that the intelligence chiefs "readily admit that, in terms of absolutes, it is quite possible that offensive missiles remain on the island concealed in caves or otherwise. They also admitted that . . . based on skepticism, if nothing more, there is reason for grave concern about the matter."

The Senators, who cite several substantial errors by U.S. intelligence in the past, sound as though they are pretty skeptical and pretty concerned. So are we. We've talked to a lot of Cuban refugees, who have sometimes been more accurate than the intelligence chiefs, and one of them flatly insisted that he'd seen hidden missiles on the Communist island as recently as last November. "Russian missiles are in Cuba," he said. "I know so." Where? "Maybe if you look in the caves in Pinar del Rio."

We can't look in the caves, but the Central Intelligence Agency can, and it's about time that its agents find out for certain what's going on in Cuba. To leave the Communists in a position to threaten us again with missiles from Cuba is clearly intolerable. But missiles are not the whole story. Even if the Soviets have no missiles in Cuba, they have troops and armor—and the political position that goes with military presence. The administration indicates that quiet diplomacy is getting the Soviets to reduce their troops. A reduction is not enough. We suspect the Soviets plan to keep troops in Cuba indefinitely, and we think that even one Soviet soldier in the Western Hemisphere is one too many. Instead of just quiet diplomacy, we think Mr. Kennedy should use his well-known skill at quiet arm-twisting.

Getting rid of the Soviet troops isn't the whole story either. For as long as Castro rules Cuba, he will be maintaining a political beachhead for communism in Latin America—a beachhead that he's trying to expand by subversion, propaganda, and terrorism. That is why Nikita Khrushchev welcomed his bearded protege in Moscow recently with such a lugubrious display of kissing and hugging. The two of them had a high old time swapping toasts, shooting ducks, ogling ballerinas at the Bolshoi and inspecting the missiles rolling through Red Square. On a shopping tour, Castro considered buying a belt but then remembered that he had forgotten

to bring money. Khrushchev, who supports Castro's regime with \$500 million a year, soon settled that: "I can guarantee his credit."

But can he? President Kennedy repeatedly says that he is applying economic pressure on Castro, but it seems clear that he's not applying enough. As Behr's report makes clear, Cuba today is in disastrous shape, and yet it's still permitted to do business with unscrupulous businessmen in Canada and Western Europe. The oil that Castro needs keeps flowing in. Surely it's not impossible for the U.S. Government to find means of tightening its embargo, and keep tightening it.

And finally there are the refugees—a quarter of a million of them. We'll grant that a lot of them are wild-eyed and ineffectual, as Harold Martin reports on page 28, and that their hit-or-miss bombing raids don't do much damage to Castro's fortress. But Castro's fortress won't collapse all by itself either. The Cuban refugees remember one successful guerrilla who landed in Cuba with nothing more than one small boatload of seafick amateurs—and that was Castro himself. Organizing a rebellion against a dictator is a long, slow process, but it can and should be done. Why aren't we doing it?

Back in 1960 a prominent American political figure expressed very similar views. "We must attempt to strengthen the . . . democratic anti-Castro forces in exile, and in Cuba itself, who offer eventual hope of overthrowing Castro. Thus far, those fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government." That was true when Senator John F. Kennedy said it. Isn't it true today?

An Address by Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

**HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963**

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am delighted to present an address by the Honorable James E. Webb, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This splendid address was delivered at the commencement exercise of my alma mater, the University of Florida, on May 4 of this year. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

No one can come to the university of this "first State in space" without emphasizing that what the men and women dedicated to a fulfillment of the exacting requirements of the space age have done here in Florida will live in the history of human affairs. Moreover, the way the men and women of this Nation, in making history in space, have followed the lessons of mankind's history and the traditions of democracy at its best is a tribute to the leadership of great, powerful, intellectually oriented centers of teaching and learning such as this, the university of a great State—Florida.

At the university we learn that all that we value most is a product of or intimately related to the human mind, and that most of the instruments and institutions of human

progress are recent developments in the long history of mankind.

There is the art of writing, which we have enjoyed for some 6,000 years; agriculture, with us only a little longer; Christianity, less than 2,000 years; modern science, about 300 years old, and modern technology, as revolutionized by science, developed over only about 150 years.

In the explosive development of man's knowledge of the universe in which we live, through use of his mind, consider this series of events:

In 1632, or just 330 years ago, the Cardinals who passed sentence on Galileo asserted that "the proposition that the Earth is not the center of the world and immovable, but that it moves . . . is absurd and false."

But 200 years later man had learned, and had come to accept, that the Earth is not the center of the universe, and beyond that, that the Sun also is not the center of the universe. Instead it was recognized and accepted that the universe itself is in motion, and that we here on Earth are ourselves on a spacecraft traveling at 67,000 miles an hour in a path around the Sun, which will place us a year from now 180 million miles from where we are today—that is, with reference to the Sun, which also moves.

The marvelous capacity of the human mind for perception, analysis, and insight is illustrated by the fact that Edward Everett Hale, in his book "The Brick Moon," published in 1869, was able to write imaginatively of almost unimaginable events which were not to transpire for nearly 80 years. He wrote this:

"If from the surface of the earth, by a gigantic peashooter, you could shoot a pea upward from Greenwich, aimed northward as well as upward; if you drove it so fast and far that when its power of ascent was exhausted, and it began to fall, it should clear the earth, and pass outside the North Pole, if you had given it sufficient power to get it half round the earth without touching, that pea would clear the earth forever. It would continue to rotate above the North Pole, above the Feejee Island place, above the South Pole and Greenwich, forever, with the impulse with which it had first cleared our atmosphere and attraction."

Today, the human mind has made Hale's imaginary peashooter come true in the form of the modern space booster.

Twenty-five years after Hale's book, John Jacob Astor, who is best remembered for building the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and going down with the *Titanic*, wrote a novel, "Journey to Other Worlds," in which men traveled to the planets. Although written almost three-quarters of a century ago, the book contains an artist's drawing of a spacecraft which might almost have been conceived by a designer of the Apollo spacecraft in which the first American astronauts will take off from Cape Canaveral and travel to the moon.

In the foreword to this book, Hale offered the comment that "there can be no question that there are many forces and influences in nature whose existence we as yet little more than suspect. How interesting it would be," he said, "if, instead of reciting past achievements, we would devote our consideration to what we do not know."

He continued, "It is only through investigation and research that inventions come; we may not find what we are in search of, but may discover something of perhaps even greater moment. It is probable that the principal glories of the future will be found in as yet untrodden paths."

Hale's pea has become a mancarrying satellite, the Mercury capsule, and the whole vista of space is opening up to man. Meanwhile, your generation has lived close enough to dramatic achievements in space to understand the profound truth of Astor "that the principal glories of the future will

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9851

AN EXAMPLE OF INDIA'S NEUTRALISM

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article in the Indian Express published in Bombay, India. It certainly raises some interesting questions about the sincerity of India's professions of neutralism.

The article follows:

AN EXAMPLE OF INDIA'S NEUTRALISM

It is painfully clear to most educated Indians that Mr. Nehru's foreign policy is not as successful as they would have wished, and nowhere has its irrational feature been revealed so clearly than in India's attitude toward Israel. India's refusal to normalize her political relations with Israel cannot be justified on any account.

Mr. Nehru has said times without number that India's policy is "friendship with all and enmity toward none." How then does he explain his policy toward Israel? When the United Nations Palestine Commission considered the question of the partition of Palestine into Israel and Arab States, Mr. Nehru instructed his representatives on the Commission to vote against the proposal. Nevertheless, the Commission in its collective wisdom, by a majority vote decided to recommend the creation of Israel.

Even after that Mr. Nehru could have asked his representatives to vote for the resolution when it went to the General Assembly. But he did not; instead he again instructed his nominees to vote against the resolution. How then can he justify his statement that his policy is friendship will all? On the contrary it clearly suggests that he has been from the very beginning hostile to the creation of Israel.

GREAT CHAMPION

Mr. Nehru is a great champion of democracy. As such, one would have expected him to accept the majority decision and abide by it. But he did not do so. Mr. Nehru is a staunch supporter of the United Nations and Israel, as everybody knows, was established in accordance with the U.N. resolution. If he is true to his principle, he should have accepted the U.N. decision. If he himself does not accept a U.N. decision, how can he blame other countries for disobeying the U.N.? At least we know that some nations disobeyed the U.N. only when its decisions went against their vital interests. But what does India lose by having diplomatic relations with Israel?

One of the reasons why India has not diplomatically recognized Israel, we are told, is that Muslim countries are hostile to Israel and therefore if India recognized Israel, they will turn hostile to India. This argument is fallacious. India has in the course of time accorded Israel de facto recognition. The Arab nations have not protested to India; nor have they turned hostile to India.

Supposing it is true that the Arab nations will turn hostile to India if she accords Israel diplomatic recognition, does it not follow that India's "independent and impartial" foreign policy is not what it is claimed to be? Is India's foreign policy dictated by the Arab countries? Mr. Nehru will not admit it, but that is what it amounts to.

Mr. Nehru said in Parliament last year—when Mr. H. V. Kamath raised the question—that it was not in India's interest to have diplomatic relations with Israel. What he in fact implied was that if he opened a diplomatic office in Jerusalem and gave reciprocal facilities in New Delhi to Israel, the Arab

countries would criticize Mr. Nehru for being friendly with the enemy. If the Arabs are fighting with somebody, it is their business. What has India's policy got to do with it? Further, does it not follow that a great country like India has allowed herself to be held at ransom by the Arab nations in their dispute with Israel?

NEGATIVE POLICY

Mr. Nehru has often said that he was not afraid of any country; and his policy was not based on the fear of anybody. If so, how does he explain his policy towards Israel which is based on nothing but fear of the Arab countries? What can one say of a policy which is so negative in content and purpose?

Mr. Nehru has often preached to the Western countries particularly to the United States that they should not shut their eyes to this reality of the existence of Communist China. Why then is he blind to the reality of the existence of Israel? Further, why is it that he does not give the same advice to President Nasser and company who still entertain the ambition of destroying Israel and throwing the Jews in the Mediterranean? Why this double standard in India's foreign policy?

President Nasser is a cosignatory with Mr. Nehru and Mr. Chou En-lai to (the now much discredited) Nehru's five commandments (Panch Shil) the most important of which is respect for the territorial integrity of other nations. Is not President Nasser's goal of the destruction of Israel a serious violation of the U.N. Charter and of the Nehru doctrine of coexistence?

When China attacked India, Mr. Nehru wrote to Mr. Ben-Gurion also seeking support and sympathy for India. Aggression is aggression, if it is Communist China's or President Nasser's. Why was Mr. Nehru silent when the Arabs attacked the tiny State of Israel soon after the U.N. passed the resolution creating that State? Why was he again vocal when Israel in self-defense tried to scotch Egypt's plan to invade Israel by striking first?

The former Indian Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, Mr. B. F. H. B. Tyabji, is reported to have said after a tour of the Middle East that one of the reasons why India has not exchanged Ambassadors with Israel is that Israel is in occupation of a small area that was not given to her by the U.N. But who is responsible for it? Who asked the Arabs to invade the tiny State of Israel? The original aggression was started by the Arabs with a view to wiping out the new State. Less than 600,000 inhabitants were attacked by well-organized States with a population of more than 45 million from all sides. The fact that the Jewish people not only fought but forced their enemies to sue for peace is one of the greatest heroic deeds in world history. The Arabs agreed to the cease-fire because, if they had continued their fight, they would have been humiliated further and would have lost more territory.

FLIMSY EXCUSES

In any case is it not a strange practice of morality that Egypt and the other Arab countries which first invaded Israel are not only recognized and patronized by Mr. Nehru, while the victim of that aggression has been blamed by him for repulsing that aggression? Is it not strange that India should make flimsy excuses for not according diplomatic recognition to Israel?

Assuming that Israel has occupied a little area of the aggressors, is it a valid reason for India to refuse the friendship of Israel? Has not Pakistan occupied one-third of Kashmir which is Indian territory and China large chunks of Ladakh and the North-East Frontier Agency? Why did not Mr. Nehru break diplomatic relations with both? What can one say of a policy which says that because

somebody has occupied somebody else's territory, India will not have diplomatic relations with that somebody, but when its own territory has been occupied it had no inhibition in flirting with the aggressors?

No country has a greater vital economic and strategic interest in the Middle East than the United Kingdom, but it is not afraid to have diplomatic relations with Israel. President Nasser and Arab colleagues could do nothing to prevent other powers from having normal political relations with Israel. Today President Nasser is being wooed by Russia but it was the same Russia which gave steadfast support to Mr. Trygve Lie and the U.N. to implement the partition of Palestine.

President Nasser could not blackmail Russia. Further, oil-rich countries have given concessions to the United Kingdom and the United States of America. They have not withdrawn from them because of their friendship with Israel. Even a Muslim country like Turkey and smaller nations like Nepal and Burma, are more courageous and have diplomatic relations with Israel.

All this clearly shows that the Indian fear is either imaginary or that India is deliberately using this imaginary fear as an excuse for not having diplomatic relations with Israel.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the close of the legislative business on Wednesday, June 19, to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

UNITED STATES MAKES DEAL WITH COMMUNIST CUBA PERMITTING U.S. OVERFLIGHT OF CUBAN PLANES FOR CUBA OVERFLIGHT BY U.S. PLANES

(Mr. CRAMER was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious now that the State Department made a new deal with the Communists in Cuba that permits U.S. airplanes overfly Cuba, by withdrawing the previous prohibition of such overflights, in obvious exchange for allowing Cuban aircraft to overfly the United States.

This makes it obvious that the New Frontier policy is resulting in drifting closer and closer to coexistence with communism in Cuba. We are coming closer and closer to giving in on another of Castro's five demands—one of which has already been conceded dealing with preventing exile Cuban raids on Cuba. The second demand was for gradual renewal of commercial relations. Gradually, the American people are being brainwashed into thinking that carrying on some negotiations with Castro—vis-a-vis—the prisoner exchange indemnity deal—permitting a little commerce to overfly each other's countries—giving in to one of Castro's demands—is not so bad because after all there are many other things we are not doing for the Communists in Cuba. The logical long-range result of chipping away at our professed policy of an economic and political quarantine of Cuba is that eventually we will

be coexisting with Communists in this hemisphere. We cannot permit this to happen and that is why calling public attention to each move in that direction I believe is essential.

Two weeks ago I revealed that the FAA is permitting Cuban planes to overfly the United States. I also demanded that this practice be halted.

But, instead of banning these overflights, the New Frontier has worked out a swap with Castro which permits U.S. commercial airplanes to fly over Cuba in exchange for Cuban planes flying over the United States.

It is obvious that the United States is negotiating with Castro and has worked out this deal with his government. Otherwise, how could the administration know such U.S. planes would not be subject to hijacking or attack?

How can we possibly expect other nations to isolate this dictator when in this instance the United States is working with him on a business-as-usual basis. It is becoming more and more obvious that we do not mean what we say when we ask other nations to quarantine Castro and that we do not intend to do so ourselves.

I renew my demand to the State Department that we ban Cuban planes from flying over the United States and that a complete economic and political quarantine of Cuba be our policy.

I also call upon the administration to level with the American people as to what deals are being made with Castro and who the U.S. Ambassador to Cuba without portfolio is.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 hour on Monday next following the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HAYS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY REGARDING SPECIAL ORDERS

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this 1 minute to direct a parliamentary inquiry. In view of the fact that one Member of this Congress has taken it upon himself to exercise his rights in objecting to special orders, I would like to inquire whether I am correct in assuming that a Member may introduce a resolution to address the House and let it go through the normal procedures similar to those for any other resolution which does not require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules of the House the gentleman is permitted to introduce any type of resolution at any time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL, for Thursday, June 6, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. CLAUSEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for Wednesday and the balance of this week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HORAN, his remarks in Committee of the Whole on the agriculture appropriation bill, and to include tables and other extraneous matter.

Mr. BURLESON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS and to include an address by the Honorable James Webb.

Mr. MATTHEWS, to extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole, immediately following the remarks of Mr. WHITTEN.

Mr. HALEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL to include in his remarks in Committee of the Whole extraneous matter including tables and letters.

Mr. CANNON and to include an article from a Missouri paper on James Aloysius Farley.

Mr. BURLESON to extend his remarks following those of Mr. POACE during general debate today.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. NYGAARD) to follow the remarks of Mr. HOEVEN and to include an article.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. NYGAARD) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCLORY, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NYGAARD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. VAN PELT.

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. ALGER in five instances.

Mr. FIRNIE.

Mr. DOLE.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. MCINTIRE and to include extraneous matter in relation to remarks on floor today.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. HOSMER in four instances.

Mr. MATHIAS in three instances.

Mr. CURTIS in three instances.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. CAREY in eight instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. STAEBLER in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. BURKE.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in four instances.

Mr. STRATTON in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. COOLEY in the body of the RECORD during the debate on H.R. 6754.

Mr. RYAN of New York in the body of the RECORD during the debate on H.R. 6754.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; and

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; and

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

901. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, relative to reporting two violations of subsection (h), pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665 (1) (2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

902. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

903. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of

Schools in Brooklyn and Queens were closed by law in 1860 on Anniversary Day, because it was found that the majority of them took off to celebrate anyway.

There will be 26 separate parades in Brooklyn, with the main one along the long meadow in Prospect Park. The reviewing stand along that line of march will be studied with notables, including Mayor Wagner, Borough President Stark, Parks Commissioner Newbold Morris, and Fire Commissioner Edward Thompson.

The union was founded by Joshua Sands; the first celebration of its inception was in 1829, at the Sands Street Methodist Episcopal Church. The first annual parade was held on June 26, 1838.

Now the celebration is held on the first Thursday in June.

This is the 147th anniversary of the founding. There will be a luncheon at 12:30 p.m. at the Montauk Club, Eighth Avenue and Lincoln Place.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I was quite amused about 2 weeks ago when the Agency for International Development sent me a release announcing that the A. B. Chance Co. of Centralia, Mo., in my district, had been awarded a contract for industrial goods under the foreign-aid program. Mr. Gano Chance, the chairman of the board of the A. B. Chance Co., is the most illustrious member of the John Birch Society in Missouri. Mr. Chance, on May 31, wrote me objecting to this practice of AID. Although I do not agree with Mr. Chance in regard to the John Birch Society—I feel that the Nation would be better off if the John Birch Society did not exist—I do feel that Mr. Chance validly objects to the efforts of the Agency for International Development to sell the foreign-aid program on the basis of what it will do for the economy of this country. I hope no Member of the House will permit his vote to be influenced by the impact which foreign aid has on the economy of his district.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONCERTED DRIVE NEEDED FOR OAS ACTION ON CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a special OAS committee headed by Ambassador de Laval of Peru has just made its recommendations for concerted action against Cuba available to the full OAS Council.

Three of our Latin American friends have requested that action on these recommendations be withheld until at least July 3 of this year. The countries in question are Mexico, Bolivia, and Brazil.

Mr. Speaker, the De Laval committee has been working on these recommendations since last October. There is no valid reason to procrastinate OAS consideration of these recommendations.

These three countries have received generous U.S. aid for some time now, yet, they are doing their utmost to stall positive hemispheric action against Castro.

During fiscal year 1962 alone, Brazil received a total of \$242 million in U.S. aid, Mexico received a total of \$143 million, and Bolivia received \$35.5 million. Yet, these three countries are not doing their utmost to secure speedy hemispheric action against communism in this hemisphere.

It is high time this Nation started directing its aid program more toward nations willing to cooperate with our national goals, and not so much toward those who are unwilling to exert full effort for the cause of freedom.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia on Monday, June 17, instead of Monday, June 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPENDING CUTS

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I noted in Robert Albright's column in the Washington Post of May 26, that our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman CHARLES S. JOELSON has encountered: a "deafening silence" in response to his challenge to Members of Congress to let him know where spending cuts can be made in their own districts. Well, here are three instances in my district—the 13th of California.

Case No. 1—Closing of Camp San Luis: In 1961, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense recommending that this Army base be closed, the military personnel located there be assigned elsewhere, and the several hundred acres involved be returned to the tax rolls.

Case No. 2—Transfer of the Yards and Docks supply office at Port Hueneme

Naval Construction Battalion Center to Pennsylvania: Civilian personnel affected: 242 employees. The Navy claimed it could do the job with 68 fewer persons. I requested high-level Navy officials to review their initial decision; this was done, with the result that the potential savings were verified. Upon receiving this verification, I stated:

I believe that, in line with my pleas for greater efficiency and reduction in Federal spending, I am in no position to enter a protest.

Case No. 3—Channel Islands: I have not introduced a companion House bill to Senator ENGLE's bill authorizing the Federal Government to acquire the Channel Islands in my district. This acquisition would involve a Federal expenditure of at least \$20 million.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of months I have taken the floor to call attention to the crime situation in Washington, not having to do with law enforcement, but the prosecution of the law. I am quite sure you are all aware that it is almost a year ago that my secretary was unfortunately attacked in St. Peter's Church, just 2 blocks away, and stabbed 10 times. She was almost to the point of death. She is now fully recovered, I believe. However, the criminal was arrested and pleaded guilty as far back as April of this year. Up to the present time this man has not been sentenced. He has been cleared by St. Elizabeths. Everything has been done, but still he has not been sentenced for that crime and the confession of other crimes.

There is another criminal who murdered a policeman about 3 years ago. To this day he has not been sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia.

I say that if we in the Congress and if we in the District are to show an example to this Nation, I think our committees should get busy and find out what is wrong with justice in Washington, D.C., in trying to make this a safe place for people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

June 6, 1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9785

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, with the dean and all the other members of the Chicago delegation I am deeply grieved by the passing of Emil V. Pacini and extend to Mrs. Pacini, his son, William, and his daughters, my deepest sympathy. Our warm friendship and association together in the councils of the Democratic Party of Cook County covered many years. He dedicated his life to the service of the people of his ward and of the city of Chicago. The zoning amendments for which in large measure he was responsible, and which represented months of hard and highly intelligent work, stand as a lasting monument to his memory.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join in eulogizing Emil Pacini, who for many years has been one of the outstanding aldermen of the city of Chicago. During his service on the Chicago City Council, he acquired renown as chairman of the zoning commission, and became a recognized expert in intricate zoning problems of the metropolitan areas of the country. He was a dedicated family man, a hard-working, conscientious public official, the type of man who demonstrated the effectiveness of the principle of home rule.

I join the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, and other Members of Congress from the Chicago metropolitan area, in paying my respects to his memory and extending my deepest sympathy to his family and loved ones in his untimely passing.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from the city of Chicago, in expressing my feelings of genuine sorrow on the loss of Hon. Emil V. Pacini who served in the city council for many years.

I have known Alderman Pacini for more than 20 years. He served as chairman of the committee on building and zoning and helped draw up the comprehensive zoning ordinance of 1957 which involved a full review of every parcel of property in Chicago.

He was loved and endeared by the people he represented. He established the reputation as being a champion of the poor and those in need of aid. He was a great public servant and he will be missed by the people of his locality.

To his widow and family, I wish to convey my feelings of genuine sorrow for the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock that I learned of the passing of Emil V. Pacini in Chicago.

Mr. Pacini was a very dear friend of mine for many years. He was an outstanding Chicagoan, having been a leader in the civic and political life of Chicago for many years.

Mr. Pacini was the Democratic ward committeeman of the 10th ward of Chicago and represented that ward in the Chicago City Council for over 20 years. His major contribution to the city was the enactment of the legislation of the Chicago Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, and the modernization of the Chicago Building Code.

My association with him in the city council and the County Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Cook

County enabled me to become aware of his strong character and devotion to his public duties.

The city of Chicago will experience great loss, especially the people of the South Chicago community. My sympathy to Mrs. Pacini and family in this great hour of grief.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to join with many others who express their sympathy over the passing of Mr. Emil V. Pacini, a former alderman in the city of Chicago, who was serving as ward committeeman of Chicago's 10th ward at the time of his death.

Emil was first elected to the city council by the residents of the 10th ward in 1945 and he served these people until April of this year. Having had the privilege of serving with him as a member of the Cook County Democratic Central Committee, I can say he was a sympathetic man and a person who believed in doing everything possible for the welfare of his people. He was a diligent, hard-working public servant.

He will be missed, and his passing is a loss not only to the residents of the 10th ward he so ably represented, but to the city of Chicago. As an expert on building and zoning he achieved a great deal for the benefit of Chicago's citizenry.

I wish to extend condolences to Mrs. Pacini and the family in the loss of this splendid man.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my Chicago colleague in tribute to the memory of Emil V. Pacini and in expression of sympathy to the members of his family. He was held in high and affectionate regard by many in southern Illinois and his reputation as a zoning authority was well established among the municipal officials in the cities down State. His death is a blow not only to Chicago, but to all the State of Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Emil V. Pacini ends the political career of one of the most active aldermen and committeemen of the city of Chicago.

His political activity in the 10th ward of our beloved city won for him recognition as a leader among the officials of the Democratic Party. He entered the city council in 1945, serving on many of its important committees until his political retirement in April 1963.

He was chairman of the powerful committee on building and zoning whose jurisdiction covered the implementation of Chicago's intricate Wacker plan for the beautification of Chicago and modernization of the classification of the use of city property zoned to accomplish this purpose.

In 1957, Chairman Pacini, with his committee, perfected the ordinance passed by council which is the present zoning regulation for the city of Chicago. It was a tremendous undertaking requiring an analytical survey of every property in the city of Chicago. The numerous conferences and public hearings entailed hours of laborious effort and the study of reports by experts in this field. It is felt by many of his as-

sociates that the chairman taxed his energy beyond physical endurance in completing this important assignment. His work contributed so much to the great strides in building a new Chicago stimulated by adoption of his ordinance promulgating the great Chicago plan after many years of delay.

He always evinced great interest in sports emanating from his auto-racing days in his youth, and boating experiences in later life. In the latter his enthusiasm carried over into his work as chairman of the Committee on Port of Chicago Wharves and Bridges.

Mr. Pacini was a gentle, soft speaking individual who valued the loyalties of friendship. He was a person independent in his thinking and no one could influence his opinion if he felt in principle that he was right.

In private life he was a building contractor. He reflected even in this employment the high sense of artistry seeking perfection. He was an expert in the lost science of installing, repairing, and making leaded church windows depicting figures and scenes of biblical significance. Piecing together the colored tinted glass fragments that led together depict the biblical versions of theological study requires a degree of patience and study that challenges the highest accomplishments of artistry.

We the congressional delegation from Illinois extend to his dear wife, Ethel, his son, William, and daughters, Mrs. Patricia McMahon and Mrs. Anita Bean our heartfelt condolence.

In his passing, Chicago has lost one of its devoted public servants and the State of Illinois, and the Nation one of its loyal and patriotic citizens.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of Alderman and Committeeman Emil V. Pacini. His death was unexpected and everyone will miss him.

His friends and supporters were numerous which can be attributed to his faithful service to the Democratic Party and to the people of his ward. As alderman of the 10th ward of Chicago he worked hard on behalf of his constituents and many of the improvements which have been accomplished in his ward over the past few years were gained through his continued efforts.

He was a man of many talents and abilities and we who knew him are grieved by his loss.

IT'S BROOKLYN DAY

(Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, with crash of brass and bray of trumpets, some 100,000 Sunday schoolteachers and children from all over the borough will begin parading tomorrow at 2 p.m. in honor of Brooklyn Day.

However, it is not, strictly speaking, "Brooklyn Day," says William S. Webb, treasurer of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union. It is the celebration of the founding of the union, established in 1816.

The union is made up of Protestant Sunday schools throughout the borough.

possible for the army to resist Sukarno's tempting proposals for a solution to these problems through a reorganization of the government. Of course, Indonesia's expansionist policy on the island of Borneo is strongly supported by the PKI, which months ago denounced the concept of Malaysia.

Thus, for the first time since the outbreak of the cold war, the forces of the free world could be faced with the problem of putting down a Communist-directed guerrilla war that is supported by a pro-Communist government which has a powerful air force and numerous surface and subsurface warships. This means that Indonesia is in a position to transport all necessary supplies for guerrillas, to ferry raiders, and to bring over Chinese Communist guerrilla war experts, if they deem that necessary. However, experts consider the Indonesian Army as one of the most skillful in the world at small-unit operations in swamp and jungles such as the terrain bordering Sarawak.

What the Borneo situation amounts to then is an unholy alliance of two Communist nations—Russia and Red China—and one pro-Communist country—Indonesia—all dedicated to elimination of anti-Communist forces from an island chain stretching more than 3,000 miles, which is the key to all the lands and waterways linking the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

Their technique is the now familiar one of guerrilla warfare and insurgency under the guise of the propaganda theme of "national liberation" from colonialism and imperialism. Actually, of course, the Indonesian attacks on Sarawak can hardly be classed as anything else than armed aggression against a fellow Asian state; and Sukarno's opposition to the United States of Malaysia is nothing but slavish adherence to the basic Communist directive to sabotage any voluntary grouping of free, democratic states.

Actually, Indonesian imperialism against fellow Asians is an old story. An example is the little-known Indonesian aggression against the people of the South Moluccas. These people, living on the so-called Spice Islands between the Philippines and the Australian Continent, have resisted the Indonesian state since 1950. A South Moluccan exile journal pointed out not long ago:

"Now for nearly 13 years a forgotten war is raging on in the jungle-interior of the island of Ceram, on the border territory of Asia and Australia. Under the sago and nutmeg trees, in the mountains and valleys of this rich tropical paradise, soldiers of the Free South Moluccan forces, with firearms, arrows, knives and even with their bare hands are fighting the Indonesian troops. Our appeal to the United Nations has been an unsettled point of the Security Council's agenda for nearly 13 years."

With a pro-Communist power controlling all of Borneo, the Communist would be in a position to subvert both Malaya and the Philippines. Consolidation of power in Borneo also could enable Indonesia to move against Portuguese Timor and the Australian-held portions of New Guinea. With the accomplishment of these political and military goals, Indonesia would stand ready to apply direct pressure against Australia itself. The long-range Communist plan for the conquest of the Indonesian archipelago, with its nearly 100 million people, clearly envisions a subsequent takeover of Australia, with its population of only 10½ million. Red China also sees in Australia an opportunity for a new China across the seas; an area where she can find relief from the terrific population pressure on the Asian mainland.

The combined Communist and pro-Communist governments in Asia have a common stake in eliminating anti-Communist control of the northern portions of Borneo. The United States and its free world allies likewise have a tremendous stake in deny-

ing Indonesia, Communist China or the U.S.S.R. any further degree of control on the island of Borneo. A successful guerrilla rebellion in Borneo could seriously hamper U.S. efforts to support a free Vietnam. It would amount to the outflanking of all that the United States is attempting to do in southeast Asia and would imperil both the Philippines and Australia, two of America's closest allies, in the global struggle against Communist domination. The United States, therefore, can no more afford a nondefense policy with respect to the free Borneo areas than it could afford to abandon the defense of South Korea in 1950.

The United States has already announced its support "in principle" for the proposed Malaysian Federation. It is high time we threw some active diplomatic and political support behind its organization. It is high time also that we reconsidered our policy of aid to Sukarno, the Red-leaning Hitler of the Indies.

OUR CUBAN POLICY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of America's most distinguished and best informed citizens on foreign affairs, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, has given eloquent and forceful expression to the feelings of millions of Americans who want to see the Communist cancer in Cuba eradicated. In an address at Newberry College on June 2, 1963, this senior American statesman, who has served his country with distinction not only as Secretary of State but also in the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Supreme Court, as Assistant President during World War II, and as Governor of South Carolina, has urged that effective action be taken to remove communism from the Western Hemisphere.

So many who have called for a tough policy on Cuban communism have been derided as being warmongers and extremists. These terms, however, cannot possibly be applied with any degree of validity to a man who himself has gone through many great ordeals in meeting Communist leaders "eyelash to eyelash" in crises which this Nation has faced in the cold war struggle with the forces of world communism. Because of his great record of service to his country at the highest levels of Government, and particularly on foreign policy matters, I feel that every Member of this body should have the opportunity of reading Governor Byrnes' outstanding address entitled "Our Cuban Policy—Facts and Fears." I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this address printed at the conclusion of these remarks, with editorial comments on the address as printed in the Greenville Piedmont of Greenville, S.C., on June 4, 1963, and the State of Columbia, S.C., on June 5, 1963.

There being no objection, the address and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CUBAN POLICY—FACTS AND FEARS

(Address by Hon. James F. Byrnes at Newberry College, June 2, 1963)

I wish I could tell you that you were going into a peaceful and carefree world with unlimited opportunities to contribute to the welfare of mankind and promote your own happiness. That has been made impossible by the policy of the Communists to seek the control of the world and dominate its people.

In the closing days of World War II when I accompanied President Roosevelt to Yalta, I heard Stalin say it was essential to the Soviets to have adjoining their country only friendly governments. In September of the same year when I was Secretary of State and attended the first meeting of the Foreign Ministers Council in London, I learned from Molotov, Soviet Foreign Minister, that while they were interested in countries adjoining the Soviet Union, their real interest was to acquire one of the Italian colonies in order to have a naval base in the Mediterranean and they also wished to influence all decisions made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who by agreement had been made Supreme Commander in the Pacific. I knew they had not abandoned their policy to gain control of the world.

The more Molotov complained of MacArthur's failure to follow the advice of the Communists, the more convinced was I of the correctness of the course the general was following. He demonstrated that he not only was one of the greatest combat generals ever to serve in the U.S. Army, but also was a statesman.

From recent history you know something of the postwar record of the Soviet Government. Whenever their military forces entered a country, they were never withdrawn. Today they completely control Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. They had military forces in North Korea for a few days prior to the cessation of hostilities with Japan. They not only retained possession of North Korea but attempted to have their North Korean puppets secure control of all Korea. In the effort to stop them, thousands of Americans lost their lives.

In Germany, the Soviets refused to make a treaty of peace because they had an opportunity to brainwash the leaders of East Germany and, as a result, they are still in control of that section of Germany and in Berlin have erected a wall to prevent the escape of the enslaved people.

Having spent the greater part of 2 years in conferences with the Soviets at international conferences, I know they will live up to an agreement only when it is to their interest. When representatives of the free world meet them in international conferences, I know they will live up to an agreement only when it is to their interest. When representatives of the free world meet them in international conferences, there is doubt as to what the Soviets will get out of the meeting but never any doubt that we will get only experience.

With this history of our relations with the Soviets since World War II and with full knowledge that there has been no change in the determination of the Communists to control the world, it is surprising that our Government and our people were put to sleep as to what was happening in Cuba. For several years we knew of Castro's violent denunciation of the United States. We knew of his seizure of the property of Americans and many of us were confident he had become a puppet of the Soviets. But we took no steps to remedy the situation.

As early as September 14, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy said "If Communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America, then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure." He was absolutely right. This was a few months before he became President. Today Communism has a foothold in Latin America. Whether or not that foothold is permanent depends upon whether we have the wisdom to realize the danger and the courage to demand the removal of that threat against this hemisphere.

There have been so many conflicting statements about the Cuban problem that many people do not know what is fact and what is

Our concern in this matter must be greater than lipservice.

There is evidence today that more highly trained professional people are returning to colleges and universities for midcareer educational instruction, thanks to the mutual dependency of both business and Government on highly trained manpower and the willingness on the part of both to underwrite the cost of such graduate study. This trend must be made to swell, for this is the kind of investment that could unlock the treasures of our mountains and valleys, and send pioneers to the moon and the stars.

I know that each step up the ladder of learning is more difficult and more challenging. I know what it means in motivation, and drive, and sacrifice to complete years of college studies. I know that many of you feel that you are entitled to settle back and enjoy that hard-earned diploma. But I call upon you—each and every one of you—to aspire for additional education. In doing so, you will not only make your own future more secure, but also that of your country.

THE INDONESIAN THREAT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are numerous spots in the world where a potential for crisis is created by Communist expansion. Officially the Government seems slow to recognize these potential areas of crisis and to take steps to deal with the situation before the crisis develops. Just such a critical area is Indonesia, as is pointed out in the Washington Report for June 3, 1963, of the American Security Council which is written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, guest editor. This report entitled "The Indonesian Threat" is most informative and I commend it to the reading of all Members of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDONESIAN THREAT

(By Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the Charleston, (S.C.) News and Courier, a member of the ASC's Strategy Staff, and a major contributor to military journals in the United States, France, Australia, and Japan)

In mid-May, an Australian Air Force general and a senior U.S. Air Force general of the Pacific Command sat deep in serious conversation on the veranda of the Army-Navy Club in Manila. The Aussie, having just returned from an extensive trip through Indonesia, was saying, "It's not the fact that practically overnight Sukarno has built himself a modern radar warning system that bothers me. What I'm concerned about is that every radar I saw was located on the southern fringes of the island chain sited so as to cover the approaches to Australia." This incident is but one of many which confirms that while the United States focuses attention on Communist attacks on the southeast Asian mainland, a new danger zone is emerging in Borneo and the neighboring islands of the Indonesian Archipelago. The ultimate danger is posed to Australia, the bulwark of Western civilization in the Southern Hemisphere.

Little noticed in this country was the endorsement by Indonesia in late April of Communist China's policies regarding Asia. In a joint statement issued in Djakarta, President Sukarno of Indonesia and Liu Shaochi, President of Red China, declared: "The two parties (Indonesia and Communist China) unanimously have held that imperialism

and colonialism were the root cause of the threat to world peace and of international support for what he called the just struggle for the peaceful unification of Vietnam. He also condemned U.S. aid for South Vietnam and backed Red China's policy for Korea.

Referring to the Red Chinese head of state as a "comrade in arms," Sukarno said that Djakarta and Peiping are united in opposition to the uniting of North Borneo, Sarawak and Brunel and Malaya in a Federation of Malaysia, scheduled to be set up on August 31.

This statement was hardly necessary, for the Indonesian guerrilla war against British North Borneo and Sarawak already had begun. Over a hundred green uniformed soldiers struck a police station at Tebedu, 3 miles inside Sarawak on April 12. The raiders were Dyak tribesmen who came from the Indonesian State of Kalimantan, which covers two-thirds of Borneo, the third largest island in the world. Trained by the Indonesian Army and reportedly directed by Brigadier General Magenda, the Chief of Intelligence of the Indonesian Combined Forces staff in Djakarta, their obvious purpose was to create an insurgency situation throughout British Borneo which would prevent the formation of Malaysia.

Indonesia's aggressive designs toward Northern Borneo can be discerned in the statements of Indonesian leaders over a period of months. On January 20, 1963, Indonesian Foreign Minister Subandrio announced that his Government had adopted a policy of "confrontation" against Malaysia. This statement was significant because "confrontation" was the official designation for Dictator Sukarno's campaign against the Dutch in New Guinea. The full significance of this language was revealed in early May when Gen. A. H. Nasution, Chief of Staff of Indonesia's armed forces, declared that northern areas of Borneo constituted Indonesia's "first line of defense." Addressing a youth congress, General Nasution said: "Support our brothers in northern Borneo with all your means. You must keep up your struggle until our brothers attain their independence." This statement is regarded as a call for the so-called freedom fighters of North Borneo, an Indonesian guerrilla group, to take action.

The joint Indonesian-Chinese statement on Borneo is of special interest because of the presence of a large Chinese population on the island. About 1 million Chinese live on Borneo. This population is largely concentrated in Sarawak and North Borneo, which are the objects of Sino-Indonesian pressure. They provide the ideal cover population needed in a guerrilla war—precisely as was the case in the Malayan rebellion.

The territory will be difficult to defend against guerrillas operating from secure bases in Indonesian-held portions of Borneo, the entire area of which constitutes a classic "privileged sanctuary." Hills and mountain ranges characterize the entire border area. It is precisely the type of terrain which favors guerrilla operations. British sources say that the dedicated Communists in Sarawak are members of the Clandestine Communist Organization (CCO) which operates primarily in the western half of the country. Already the CCO has an estimated hardcore guerrilla potential of 1,500 men of whom approximately 500 are already armed, equipped and trained.

Malayan security experts have studied reports from Borneo and concluded that Communists on that island intend to use the same guerrilla tactics employed in the Malayan rebellion that lasted from 1948 to 1960. According to these reports, the attack on Sarawak, North Borneo, and the sultanate of Brunel will be based on terrorist principles established by Chin Peng, secretary general of the Malayan Communist Party. Encour-

aged by his Communist Chinese friends, Sukarno's strategy is to alternate the use of force and threat that brought him the easy victory in West Iran. These tactics will provide him with another emotional "anti-colonial" issue which will serve to distract the attention of his people from the chaotic economic situation at home.

The guerrilla war in Borneo may thus turn out to be the most difficult conflict to suppress since the Korean war. In February, the Indonesian War Veterans' Legion announced that it was ready to organize 70,000 volunteers to help fight the British forces in Kalimantan Utara (North Borneo). Maj. Gen. Achmad Yani, the Indonesian Army Chief of Staff, has been even more specific, referring to "two divisions" being formed to support the "independence struggle." He told reporters during a personal visit to the British Borneo border area earlier in the year that preparations were being made, but that it was necessary to remain "coolheaded and await orders" from President Sukarno.

Backing up any such all-out subversive or insurgency effort stands a modern, billion dollar Indonesian armed forces organized and equipped for offensive operations by the Soviet Union. Its 40,000-man navy operates 250 ships, totaling 350,000 tons. This fleet includes one 19,000-ton heavy cruiser of the *Sverdlov* class, with another due from Russia in the near future; two *Riga* class frigates mounting ship-to-ship guided missiles, approximately 20 submarines, 7 modern destroyers, a Russian-built antisubmarine helicopter squadron, with a second due to arrive during 1963, around 60 motor torpedo boats and a dozen patrol craft.

The Indonesian Air Force numbers 23,000 men and has about 100 Soviet Mig-15, 17 and 19 fighters, plus 18 long-range, twin-jet 1,200-mile-per-hour Mig-21's. Bombers include 20 IL-28 turbojet aircraft and 10 pure jet TV-16's with a range of nearly 5,000 miles. In addition, U.S. C-100's, Soviet troop carriers, and C-47's provide a respectable transport capability. The Indonesians are reliably reported to have around 100 Soviet SA-2 "Guideline" surface-to-air missiles. These are effective to 80,000 feet. First displayed in Djakarta during the armed forces day parade last October 5, they were accompanied by a 200-man team of Russian military specialists.

The army includes about 350,000 men organized into some 130 battalions. Of these, 20 have been supplied with American infantry weapons. Others have Soviet equipment and the remainder share a mixture of arms purchased from more than a dozen nations. An extensive paratroop training program has been underway since last year which produces 200 graduates each month.

Coupled with this alarming growth of Soviet influence through massive programs of military assistance and economic credits is the country's steady drift to the left. In the offing, though not yet implemented, is Sukarno's political concept to organize a "Nasakom" cabinet which would represent what he calls the "three major elements of Indonesian society—nationalism, religion and communism." Naturally, this has the full support of Mr. D. N. Aidit, the chairman of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), whose 2 million members constitute the largest Communist party outside the bloc, and of the giant leftwing "Sobal" Trade Union Federation. This thinly veiled proposal to bring the Communist into a coalition government on equal terms with nationalist and religious leaders has encountered polite but firm opposition from the army, the principal "nationalist" organization in the country. However, the army was unable to prevent the recently completed Afro-Asian Journalists Conference from being converted into an open forum for Communist propaganda. Similarly, if economic conditions continue to deteriorate, it may also be im-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9737

fiction. About a month ago a report was filed in the U.S. Senate by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. It is known as the "Stennis committee" and is composed of four Democrats and three Republicans. That report which was unanimous was submitted only after many months of careful investigation, and was based primarily upon testimony of the intelligence chiefs. However, 70 witnesses who hold no official position and countless officials of government were heard.

It is my opinion that in an effort to secure a unanimous report on a controversial subject, the committee refrained from making some deserved criticisms of the Central Intelligence Agency and the other intelligence officials of the military services. The facts stated in that report, certainly cannot be successfully denied and the report, because of its judicial character, should have received wider circulation.

I say the intelligence agencies deserved criticism because when we now learn of the missiles, tank and other Soviet weapons of war in Cuba, we wonder what they were doing when this equipment was being transported by land in the Soviet Republic, loaded on ships, taken more than half way around the world to Cuba, and there unloaded, uncrated and transported to selected bases. This was not done overnight. Surely it required many months, but according to the record, it was not until the summer of 1962 that this movement of weapons and equally important movement of combat troops, received serious attention from our intelligence. Even then, according to the Stennis committee, the information received was not accurately evaluated. Why? Because many of those charged with that duty had the conviction—not facts—mind you—that Khrushchev would not consider arming Cuba with offensive weapons. This caused them to place little credence in the continued reports to them by Cuban exiles and others as to the military buildup on our doorsteps.

How completely they were deceived is illustrated by the committee's statement that as late as "October 22 our intelligence people estimated that there were from 8,000 to 10,000 Soviets in Cuba." They now say that at the height of the buildup there were at least 22,000 personnel on the island.

Today it is agreed by the intelligence services that even prior to July 1962 vast amounts of Soviet military equipment had been brought to Cuba and the Cuban Army was one of the best equipped in Latin America. This is their hindsight, but not until photographic evidence was obtained on October 14, did our intelligence finally conclude that there were offensive missiles on the island of Cuba. Now this was many weeks after Senator KEATING of New York and Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, had charged on the floor of the Senate that strategic missiles had been placed by the Soviets in Cuba, less than 90 miles from our shores. These Senators were charged with being warmongers and with making reckless statements, even though it was obvious their statements were based upon information from the Pentagon. I am proud that one of the two Senators who had the courage to present the facts was a South Carolinian.

There is cause for fear when even a week after the President's speech, in an unclassified brochure published by the Defense Department, entitled "Cuba," the Soviet personnel on the island was estimated to be only 5,000.

Before admitting a Cuban crisis, our officials wanted what they called "hard evidence." That was secured by a U-2 reconnaissance and in the taking of the pictures a gallant South Carolinian, Major Anderson, of Greenville, lost his life. Those pictures convinced the President and his security aids of the duplicity of the Soviets.

Khrushchev had gone to extreme lengths to put us to sleep and to keep us asleep. Through a representative in the Soviet Embassy he expressed the hope that Americans would understand that any weapons he was sending to Cuba were intended for defensive purposes only.

After the President had received the photographic confirmation of the presence of strategic missiles in Cuba, the Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, called on the President. He discussed only the situation in Berlin, obviously trying to divert the attention of the President from Cuba, which was mentioned only incidentally. The President read to Gromyko his warning issued a month earlier that if Russia turned Cuba into an offensive military base we would do "whatever must be done."

The Soviets believe that a successful diplomat must be a successful liar. Gromyko then demonstrated his talent by telling the President Russia "would never become involved in offensive military capability in Cuba." With the photographs, the President had, he knew that statement was false. He conferred with his security aids and with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and determined upon the course which on the evening of October 22 he announced to the world.

As he spoke, I could hear the voice of Teddy Roosevelt demanding respect for the United States; I could recall hearing Woodrow Wilson address the Congress in 1917, urging with reluctance that we declare war upon Germany; I could hear Franklin Roosevelt the day after Pearl Harbor calling upon the Congress to recognize that a state of war existed between the United States and the Axis powers.

The people of the United States with unanimity expressed support of the Government in the steps the President proposed to take to put an end to the Khrushchev-Castro threat to freedom. No man has ever spoken from a position of such great power and strength as did the President on October 22. The moment he began, an order was given in the Pentagon that resulted in an immediate worldwide alert of the U.S. Military Establishment. That included every unit of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force. It included our nuclear strength, which admittedly is far superior to that of the Soviets. That order was a shock to Khrushchev, who respects only force.

There is some justification for believing that ever since his first meeting with President Kennedy at Vienna, Khrushchev has believed he could expect a softer attitude from us. There is no other way of explaining his unexpected action to make of Cuba a Communist Gibraltar. As he proceeded for 2 years to establish a bastion of military power at our very door, with atomic power sufficient to destroy not only the United States but all of Latin America outside of Cuba, he truly changed the balance of power in the world. Instead of consuming a year or two in building long-range missiles which from bases in Russia could strike a target in the United States, now he could use short-range missiles from his Cuban bases to destroy this hemisphere.

Suddenly he was confronted by the President with a demand to remove his weapons. That demand was backed by action. He yielded, to the gratification of every American. But what has happened since October does not justify gratification; it does cause some fears.

In the light of the duplicity which had victimized us, the President, in his demand, insisted upon the right to have "on-sight inspection" to assure removal of the offensive weapons.

For years, in negotiations to restrict the use of atomic weapons we have insisted upon inspection by an international commission. In view of this demand as to atomic bases

in Russia, we could ask no less with the actual threat in Cuba.

Last October the President, referring to this subject stated "the United States intends to follow closely the completion of this work through a variety of means, including aerial surveillance, until such time as an equally satisfactory international means of verification is effected."

When Khrushchev agreed to the removal of the strategic weapons, he indicated agreement to on-site inspection by United Nations authorities. A few days later we were told that Castro refused to agree and the Soviets would have to support Castro's position.

I am confident the Soviets could force Castro to agree to the inspection at any time. That was only an excuse. However, we abandoned our demand and no one of us is certain of the number of Soviet weapons and combat forces in Cuba today.

Our embargo was removed in 30 days after it was imposed. There was evidence while it lasted that certain weapons were removed although there is no assurance that all offensive weapons were removed or how many have been brought in since that time. We are told by our intelligence that it is impossible to know what weapons are hidden in the caves of Cuba. Are we in any more secure position today than we were prior to October 22?

In view of the deliberate falsehoods told us for 2 years, we cannot accept the word of Khrushchev as to the character of weapons there. There is an old Indian adage that seems fitting:

"Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

The Soviets have fooled us not only twice but on every occasion when it was to their interest and they thought they could get away with it.

Our Cuban policy apparently has been to isolate Cuba diplomatically and cripple her economically. Apparently, it has been our hope that the Soviets would find it economically burdensome, would tire of shouldering the burden and abandon its interest in Cuba. There is no justification for such hopes. To isolate the United States is part of their long-range plan. Regardless of your optimism, you must realize how futile is that hope after the recent demonstration in Moscow.

In the presence of thousands of spectators Khrushchev pledged all-out support of his Communist brother Castro and of Cuba. This pledge has been heralded to the world. Upon it Castro is certain to rely and may act. Nor is there justification for the hope that the Cuban people will revolt against Castro while Soviet troops are there. The people have the example of Hungary and East Berlin.

The permanent foothold of which Senator Kennedy expressed fear in 1960 is now a reality unless the United States shall take steps to prevent it.

The Senate committee concluded its report with this wise statement, "The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad are certain to doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorsteps."

It is obvious that for similar reasons Latin American Republics will conclude that we are unable to protect them. They will be subverted one by one until all of South America is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

Responsible sources tell us that after Khrushchev's agreement to remove offensive weapons from Cuba, the United States removed strategic weapons from its bases in

9738

Turkey. It is said that this was done because our atomic submarines make the retention of such bases no longer a necessity. We hope this was a fact and not an excuse for action that might appeal to the Soviets as appeasement. Appeasement never stops a war, it only postpones it.

Ambassador Chip Bolen, who in my opinion is the best informed American in public life as to Russia and its people, is credited with having said that Khrushchev is fond of quoting a Lenin adage that goes like this: "If a man sticks out his bayonet and hits cold steel, he pulls back, but if he strikes mush, he keeps on pushing."

We have another fear: Sources usually reliable report that the Soviets are establishing several submarine bases in Cuba. The explanation offered for the harbor improvements, is that it is for a fleet of fishing boats.

Because of the doubt that exists as to the removal of offensive weapons; the number of Soviet combat personnel brought into Cuba recently, and the development of submarine bases, the United States should renew the demand by the President last October for on-site inspection by an international commission.

Khrushchev knows that by his duplicity he put us to sleep for more than a year. He must not be allowed to think that when we awoke last October we turned over and went back to sleep.

This is not political criticism of the administration. It has always been my belief that in the field of foreign affairs there should be no partisan politics. Wars are fought by men of all political parties. Soviet bombs from Cuba would make no political distinction among people.

Instead of looking to the past and indulging in charges and countercharges about the responsibility for what are deemed mistakes, we should look to the future and unite in making secure the safety and freedom of our people.

I am aware of the fear that any effort to force Castro to submit to on-site inspection may result in nuclear war. Khrushchev knows of our fears and he has used it to frighten us. But he is aware that if he attacks us, with our superior atomic weapons, we will destroy the Soviet Republic within a few hours.

Should the President renew his demand for on-site inspection by an international commission, the Soviet Premier may again agree and persuade his puppet Castro to agree. In such case, all fears on this score would be removed.

If Khrushchev or Castro refuses, then I hope the President will immediately renew his quarantine of Cuba by air and sea to make certain that no more Soviet offensive weapons or combat troops are landed in Cuba. I suggest this action because the President took such steps last October and announced his intention to follow through.

If these steps do not result in the removal from Cuba of Soviet arms and troops, then I hope the President, after conferring with his military advisers, will take whatever steps are necessary to force the withdrawal of all Soviet offensive weapons and combat troops and keep them out. The President can act with the assurance that the peaceful but courageous people of the United States will support any action he may take to accomplish this and insure the safety and freedom of the people of this hemisphere.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, June 4, 1963]

BYRNES ON CUBAN THREAT

James F. Byrnes has put into clear and precise words the feeling of many, many Americans who are concerned about Cuba.

Speaking at Newberry College commencement exercises, South Carolina's senior statesman called for a tougher U.S. policy

toward the Castro-Soviet state, for onsite inspections to uncover any Russian missiles or other weaponry and, if necessary, a quarantine of Cuba enforced by a U.S. sea and air fleet.

"If these steps do not result in the removal of Soviet arms and troops, then I hope the President, after conferring with his military advisers, will take whatever steps are necessary to force the withdrawal of all Soviet offensive weapons from Cuba," Mr. Byrnes said.

While Mr. Byrnes carefully disclaimed any intention of criticizing the Kennedy administration, the fact remains that the President has continually minimized the danger from Cuba to the United States while allowing the Monroe Doctrine to be destroyed.

No one aware of the Communist goal of world domination can possibly doubt that Russian troops and weapons in Cuba were put there in the first place as a threat to the United States; no one can possibly think that their continued presence there does not still pose a threat.

The threat will remain until the United States wipes it out. That is what Mr. Byrnes sees as necessary. That is what millions of other Americans see as necessary, too.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, June 5, 1963]

WHO WILL LISTEN?

In addressing the graduates of Newberry College Sunday, Governor, Justice, Secretary of State-Assistant President James F. Byrnes said the President should take whatever steps may be necessary to force the withdrawal of all Soviet offensive weapons and combat troops from Cuba; that the President could act with assurance that the people of this country would support him in assuring the safety and freedom of this hemisphere; that Russia has deceived us whenever she could get away with it; that the President's speech of October 22 was equal to any in power and was a shock to Khrushchev "who respects only force," but that we had abandoned our demand and "Khrushchev probably thinks the sleeping United States awakened only long enough to turn over and go back to sleep."

Mr. Byrnes, as usual, is right and justified. It is also true that some of his words have a familiar ring. Others, including the State, have long since pointed out the fact that the Russians, who live by force, respect only force.

Yet we persist in the wishy-washy, no-win policy, making a show of courage only to back down and leave the field to the aggressors.

Mr. Byrnes has spoken well, as others have spoken well. But who will listen? What must it take to shake the leaders of this country out of their apathy and timidity and put them on the path of courage and determination?

Perhaps, if enough respected and patriotic citizens raise their voices in protest against the present policies the continuous drip-drop on the stony consciousness of the administration may wear down the passive resistance to reason and awaken it to positive and stalwart action. Mr. Byrnes has made his contribution.

INDIAN AGGRESSION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a news article from the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., dated June 3, 1963, and entitled: "Indian Aggression—Rivers Supports U.S. Arms Aid to Pakistan." This article reports on a newsletter by Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina in which the

distinguished Representative of the First District issues an important warning against U.S. military aid to India at the expense of our staunch ally, the Government and people of Pakistan.

Mr. President, I had the opportunity to visit Pakistan last fall and to have conferences with many Pakistan officials, including President Ayub Khan. This visit confirmed beyond any question the value of this nation to the free world and its sincere desire to continue its friendly relations with our country if we will but permit her to continue to be our ally and friend.

Pakistan is a nation which has risked much to join the Western camp. It borders on Afghanistan, India, and Iran, and is close to the Soviet Union. Of the countries sharing a common border with Pakistan, only Iran is any way connected with the Western World in the struggle against communism. Afghanistan is virtually a puppet of the Soviet Union, and until Red China attacked neutralist, socialist India, India was leaning heavily toward the Red side. But, little Pakistan—and it is not so little from the standpoint of population, having more than 90 million inhabitants—chose early to stand with the Western World.

Our country has known for some time of the bitter feuding, and at times, fighting, which has ensued between Pakistan and India over religious differences and also over the Pakistan-oriented country of Kashmir. The United Nations has supported a plebiscite for the people of Kashmir, but the Indian Government has refused to permit such a plebiscite because the Indians know the results would be against Indian wishes.

With the Pakistanis, their primary concern as a nation is Kashmir and their long fight with India. Communism is also a threat, but each country is always more concerned about its most immediate and primary threat—and in this case it comes from India. In fact, while I was in Pakistan last fall, Mr. Nehru had more troops massed on the Pakistani border than he did facing the Chinese Reds who were waging war against Indian forces in the Himalayan Mountains.

When President Ayub Khan, of Pakistan, visited this country last year, he received firm assurances from the President of the United States and the State Department that our Government understood his concern about India and the possible additional threat which his country might face if India were supplied with arms from this country. He maintains he was told that we would consult with him before giving any arms to India.

However, as soon as Mr. Nehru made his first screams for aid against the Chinese Communists, our country ran to India's assistance. In fact, this was one of the swiftest responses our country has ever made to any act of Communist aggression, and this aggression was not directed at our Nation or that of an ally, but rather at a pro-Red neutralist country. Our Government gave military aid to Mr. Nehru and did so without consulting President Khan. We only gave him a perfunctory notice of the fact that aid was being given to his arch enemy.